● PRINTER RUSH ●
(PTO ASSISTANCE)

HC Correspondence

Application : 09/700643	Examiner : NGUYEN	GAU : 1641

From: OLA   Location: IDC (FMF) FDC   Date: _____

Tracking #: _____   Week Date: _____

2nd REQUEST

DOC CODE	DOC DATE	MISCELLANEOUS
☐ 1449	_____	☐ Continuing Data
☐ IDS	_____	☐ Foreign Priority
☒ CLM	12/3/04	☐ Document Legibility
☒ IIFW	9/8/04	☐ Fees
☐ SRFW	_____	☒ Other NoA 9/8/04
☐ DRW	_____	
☐ OATH	_____	
☐ 312	_____	
☐ SPEC	_____	

[RUSH] **MESSAGE:** Claim Index (IIFW dated 9/8/04) does not reflect the approved claims dated 12/3/04 and examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05. Please resolve. Also missing page 1 of Claims. Thank you OLA

[XRUSH] **RESPONSE:** _____

NOT A GROUP ERROR

See attached

INITIALS: BTV

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.

REV 10/04

Response to Printer Rush dated 12/05/2005:

Q.   Claim Index (IIFW dated 9/8/04) does not reflect the approved claims dated 12/03/04 and examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05.

A.   These documents don't agree because they are not discussing the same set of claims. The claim index (IIFW 9/8/04) refers to the set of claims dated 6/14/2004 NOT those dated 12/03/04.

On the other hand, the examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05 refers to the set of claims in the 312 amendment dated 12/03/04

IN THE 312 AMENDMENT DATED 12/03/04, APPLICANT USED THE CLAIMS NUMBERING THAT WAS INDICATED IN THE EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT DATED 9/08/04 (NOA 9/08/04). THIS IS WHAT CAUSED ALL OF THE CONFUSION.

THE EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT DATED 11/17/05 REFERS TO THE NEW NUMBERING AND IS CORRECT.

Q.   Also missing page 1 of claim set.

A.   I am assuming that this is referring to Claims dated 12/03/04. This amendment was not properly scanned and separated. Page 1 of the claim set is in A.NA dated 12/03/04.

SOLUTION: To avoid further confusion, I am attaching a complete set of claims using the claims as renumbered. The document that I am attaching here should be considered CLMPTO